NEW YORK HERRARD SATURDAY PURIORISMS INC. THEFTER SHEET

THE SENATE'S SHAME.

Credit Mobilier's Victims Shivering in the Storm of Popular Indignation.

PIOUS PATTERSON'S PLEA.

A Long, Weak and Exceedingly Thin Statement in Extenuation.

A "COMEDY OF ERRORS."

What the Great Besmirched Thinks a Friendly Rather than a Business Transaction.

HARLAN HAULED OVER THE COALS.

The Christian Statesman's Sudden Loss of Memory.

DR. DURANT'S CHECKS.

Harlan Declines to Answer Questions Until He Knows What is Expected To Be Proved.

HE MUST ANSWER.

Revelations Concerning the Construction and Financial Condition of the Central Pacific Railroad.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 14, 1873. The special committee of the Senate, of which Senator Morrill, of Maine, is chairman, to inquire into the Credit Mobiller charges against Senators. resumed its session this morning, and Senator Conkling, of New York, was called.

resumed its session this morning, and Senator Conkling, of New York, was called.

The testimony of Mr. McComb, to the effect that Mr. Ames told him that stock had been given to Mr. Conkling, was read, together with the testimony of Mr. Ames denying that emphatically.

Mr. Conkling replied:—I can corroborate Mr. Ames that meyer owned or received, by purchase, gift or otherwise, any stock or interest in the Credit Mobilier or the Pacific Railroad Company. By the Pacific Railroad Company I mean the whole road—both the Union Pacific Railroad and Contral Pacific Railroad and I have never been an owner to any extent in either.

Senator Pattersson, of New Hampshire, was then called and made the following statement:—

In the investigation by the House Committee, of which Mr. Poland is chalirman, a conflict of statements between Mr. Ames and myself has attracted such attention as to make it proper I should now refer to it. Though a stranger to Mr. Ames when I entered Congress, I became intimately associated with him in 1864, in a tour of observation made in that year, under a resolution of Congress, of a portion of our Northeastern coast. Thrown together for several weeks, that intimacy ripened into friendship, which induced on my part the utmost trust and confidence. In 1867, influenced perhaps by a previous offer of Mr. Ames to invest money for me which would certainly be productive of profit, igave him \$3,000. Subsequently, in 1869, igave an additional \$4,000 for the same purpose. The conflict of statements to wheh I have referred relates solely to the investment of the first named sum. The \$4,000, it is admitted by both of us, were invested in the stock and securities of the Union Pacific Kailroad Company. As no writen memoranoum passed between Mr. Ames and myself when the purpose do use against me this alleged ownership of the slock and securities of the Union Pacific messed by the formal had only my memory to appeal to in determining what had been excited in the public mind arailist that company. As no writen memo Ames' letter and my demail, notwithstanding Mr. Rollins was urging against me my ownership of this stock. I sent a telegram and a letter to Mr. Ames requesting him to give me what he had written to Mr. Rollins, and finally received the following letters:—

100A'S EPISTLES TO PATTERSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 9, 1872.

and, there was no more hapropriety in it than owning bank stock. Yours truly, Hon. J. W. Patterson.

Dear Sir.—I wrote you from Mashington in reply to your telegram. I have your letters of the 8th and 12th, this evening, here, on my arrival home from Washington. I stated in that letter the substance of my letter to your telegram. I have your letters of the 8th and 12th, this evening, here, on my arrival home from Washington. I stated in that letter the substance of my letter to your telegram. I have your letters of the 8th and 12th, this evening, here, on my arrival home from Washington. I stated in that letter the wrote him, and there was nothing in that but the truth, and that Mr. Kollins should say that the Credit Mobilier of America was a fraudient concern, and that those engaged in it perpetrated a fraud on the country, community or its stockholders is simply an untruth. The stockholders of that company contained some of

and Mr. Rollins knows it. Such men as John J. Cisco, General Dix, William H. Macy, M. Dillon McCormick, James Brooks and many others or New Yora; to idden and Williams, Ezra Baker, Elisha Atkins, John Duff, Samuel Hooper, F. Gordon Dexter. Hon. John B. Alley, Oliver Ames, myself and many others, and I am proud to only the Hooper, M. Gordon Dexter. Hon. John B. Alley, Oliver Ames, myself and many others, and I am proud to was nothing wrong in holding the stock any more than was nothing wrong in holding the stock any more than in owning bank or railroad stock, and Mr. Rollins should be ashamed to make such charges, if you had been a stockholder and thanager in the company, as you were not. If Mr. Rollins can find nothing worse against you than being a stockholder in the Credit Mobilier you must be the purest man in New Hampshire or in the United States scanate. Trusting you will not stiller because you are accosed of being a stockholder with me and not realizing the profits, I am, yours truly, OAKES AMES."

This conversation with Mr. Ames and the letters which it induced would have early wh

existence to Congress, had received additional legislation, and was in a condition which made future legislation not improbable.

Mr. Patterson then quoted from the testimony of Mr. Ames before the Poland Committee on December I; to show to the effect that Mr. Patterson bought thirty shares of stock, which was transferred to a banking house in New York by his order, and, resuming, said:—These statements of Mr. Ames—so much in opposition to my own recollection, which, as already states, had been confirmed by my conversations with him and by his letters to Mr. Rollins and mysolf—greatly surprised me; still, whon appeared before the committee thought proper—these statements to the contrary notwithstanding—to give what I had always believed to have been the mode in which my tunds had been invested. My testimony was given one month after these statements were made, that is on January 16. In concluding my version of the transaction is said I had been thus explicit because I had been misrepresented, and not because I see any breach of property or personal integrity in Congressmen purchasting or hading this Credit Mobilier stock more than papter, wool, legal tender bonds, bank notes, bank stock, or any other species of property I hable to be affected by regislation, but upon which legislation was not anticipated at the time of the purchase. Again, the same idea is expressed in the examination in reference to the world have tasken the stock had he the money to do see and, continuing, said—with these than the would have tasken the stock had he the money to do see and, continuing, said—with the state that he would have tasken the stock had he the mentioned to see and the state when he should have tasken the stock had he the mentioned to see and to the state when he state that he would have tasken the stock had he the mentioned to see and to be state.

Credit Mobilier when the subject was first mentioned to me, I answered the inquiries of the committee, the statements of Mr. Aims being that he heart committee, the statements of Mr. Aims being that he here a time. Subsequent to my recollection and belief at the time. Subsequent to my examination, Mr. Aims was again called to testiny on January 25, when, in the course of his testimony he produced a receipt written, as he says, by him and signed by me, dated at Bosion May 6, 1874. Again, on January 29, he produced another receipt written also by him and signed by me, dated washington, February 14, 1805. I need not at that this was a great surprise to me. I kenw I had given him receipts in one or two instances, but had not the elightest impression or recollection that they were or

regarded my mass ariginal using my means so as been promote my interest and, therefore, readily signed whatever he wrote without that care and circumspection which ordinarily attends business transactions. In fact, this was

A FRIRNDLY RATHER THAN A BUSINESS THANACTION.

And I gave little thought to its character or details. It results from the admission made of the genuineness of my signature that Mr. Ames' state and that mine is erroment or the \$2,000 is susaint. I have always said, that I men of the \$1,000 is susaint. I have always said, that I men of the foreign the said of the Credit Mobilier than in that of the Union Pacific Railrond Company, and, entertaining these views, I would have as readily stated my ownership in the former on all occasions as I did in the latter. It was with this conviction I stated explicitly in the Senatorial canwass in New Humpshire that I had bought stock and securities in the Union Pacific Railrond, but never purchased in the Oredit Mobilier, though I could see no wrong in such an investment. This was said in good faith and without a doubtor itstruth. Whether the owner of stock in one of these companies or in both, I can conscientiously state that no improper or corrupt purpose entered into my acquisition of it, and no improper or corrupt influence was ever exerted thereby on my conduct as a legislator. Whether these statements be true is

A view Proprix Inaginar of the Radon.

If circumstances in the judgment of the Credit Mobilier stock. During the holidsys which occurred snortly after those that I had bought hirty shares of the Credit Mobilier stock. During the holidsys which occurred snortly after that I had bought hirty shares of the Credit Mobilier stock. During the holidsys which occurred snortly after that I regarded as a mistake in his evidence as to my first investment. He replied he had put the matter as he recollected it, but very likely he had forpotten the details, as it was a long time ago. He had reported to the state of the committee of his error. Then followe

at the dute of this letter was in the allegation that I was the holder of Credit Mobilier stock. Now, if the object of my letter was to procure a collusive arrangement with Mr. Ames to free me from it, I should have written, "If pressed to know whether I purchased credit Mobilier stock you can say I did not, but purchased stock in the road."

I have said the first part of my letter explained to Mr. Ames my understanding as to what had passed in reference to the Credit Mobilier. Believing this statement would satisfy and was correct, and he in tault, I thus conclude. "Don't fail to correct your original statement before the committee. It must not be reported as it now stands." Of course, my request for correction was founded on the impression that my statement should make as to its truth, Mr. Ames stated that I had written him other letters. The only other letters which I had written him have been notes asking him to call at my oom or allow me to call at his.

After naving written the foregoing for the purpose of presenting it to the committee. I received in answer to inquiries from my business correspondent in New York information which goes to confirm the statement made by Mr. Ames of the transfer and deposit of stock in the Credit Mobilier to my account and benefit, with the firm of Morton, lilies & Co., thoush previous communications from the same correspondent confirmed me in the belief expressed in my examination before the Poland Committee, that no such stock had been transferred to me or to others for my benefit. To state this whole transaction briefly,

which I receipt, without giving any aced to the character of the receipt written by him; this he repeats. From all this is left on my mind the impression that he had purchased for me securities in the road, and not an interest in the Credit Mobilier.

Third—At Pittsbuller. In his suit with McComb. Mr. Ames, as was generally understood, had sworn he did not hold Credit Mobilier stook in trust for any one. As he had delivered none to me at that I owned one. As he had delivered none to me at that I owned one. As he had delivered none to me at that I owned one. As he had delivered none to me at that I owned one to me at that I owned one to me at the left of the characteristic of the conversations and in letters, that I was a stock-holder in the Credit Mobilier, that I ever received any of the stock or any profits on any stock. Had I not a right to believe and assert the same? Then came on the stock or any profits on any stock. Had I not a right to believe and assert the same? Then came on the conversation of the stock or any profits of me to Morton. Bliss & Co. of New York. I wrote to Mr. Morton to learn the tacts, and atterwards, on my way through New York, saw him in person. He said they had never held any of that stock for any one. Thus I was led into a false impression of the facts of this case. I never spoke with a prolounder sense of truth of what I said than when before the committee of the House, and if in error I now profest the credit belongs to others, and not to me. I have made this statement will, the frankness which should characterize such communications. If I have misjudged in supposing that my ownership of stock in either of the companies is compatible with the exercise of finy legislative obligations and duties, i shail how to your determination. The committee reassembled at hall-past two o'clock, and Senator Bartan was recalled. In answer to questions of Senator Bartan on TIR Racs.

The committee reassembled at hall-past two o'clock, and Senator Bartan was recalled. In answer to questions of Sena

seen copies of the checks or the stubs since they were given away; had a conversation with Dr. Durant in relation to the checks, and asked him if any checks had been drawn by him or paid out of the funds of the Union Pacific Railroad Company to aid the election of witness in Iowa; he replied insthe negative.

Mr. Stevenson—I have been notified that the stubs of the checks were shown to vou in a committee room in the Capitol. Before proceeding to introduce that winness I would prefer that you examine your papers, as you say you retain press copies, in order that you may you retain press copies, in order that you may

The witness replied that he would examine his papers, and he could probably fix the date; he had no recollection of having been shown stabs or cepies of the checks in the Capitol; witness wanted to know if there were any witnesses against him; if so he had a right to hear their testimony before replying.

Senator Stevenson said he had been informed by a geneticm and that the inter could be proved that stubs or copies of the checks were shown to Mr. Harlan in a committee room in the Capitol; be Genator Stevenson did not say it was so, but had been so told, and desired to ask Mr. Harlan about it.

Mr. Stockton said be had been informed that the \$10,600 was not used for election nursess, and he had been the capitol with the study of the checks were shown to Mr. Harlan in a committee room in the Capitol; be Genator Stevenson did not say it was so, but had been so told, and desired to ask Mr. Harlan shout it.

it was so, but had been so told, and desired to ask Mr. Harian about it.

Mr. Stockton said be had been informed that the \$10,000 was not used for election purposes, and he therefore desired to ask Mr. Harian it he received the money himself, and it so what he did with it. He had been informed that the money was given to Mr. Liarlan for another purpose and not for election purposes. He did not say it was true, and therefore asked the question.

CUTTING TOO CLOSE FOR MITTER MARIAN.

Mr. Harlan raised the question asto the authority of the committee to give the did not supposed the committee to give the did not supposed the committee to investigate the charge or Credit Mobilier corruption and not all these outside questions.

Senator Savenson—I have seen charges published in a leading republican paper—the Charland Guette—charging that this money was given to influence the action of Senator Stockton said Dr. Durat that stated that this money was given to all of the election of Mr. Harlan, and he could shape the election. The witness now raises the point that

money was given to and in the election of Mr. Harian, as he could shape the election. The witness now raises the point that

about it until he finds out what we expect to prove. The question he desired to ask the witness now is what disportion he made of that money. It remator harian desires or preferrit postpoint answering this question until another time, I have no objection. It is not as a matter of curiosity on my part. This thing has been made public in the newspapers, and least time duty, as a member of Mr. Harian said he understeed the Senator from Kentocky (Mr. stevenson) to say that he bad additional information in regard to the checks, and he thought he had a right to that information before being called upon to testify.

Mr. Morrill said members of the committee need not give witnesses their reasons for asking questions. Every senator on the committee had a right to ask any questions he desired without giving reasons to the witness.

Mr. Stockton asked the witness again if he got the money for those two checks. A ligot the money for one, I remember distinctly, and I suppose I got that for the other also. They were both under my control however.

Q. Who got the meney: A Lendorsed it and gave it to a friend to get the money; whether he gave the money to me or handed it to some triend I don't remember.

Q. What is the name of the friend to whom you handed the check?

Mr. Harian—I do not want to bring in the names of

Mr. Harlan-I do not want to bring in the names of

Q. What is the name of the friend to whom you handed the check?

Mr. Harlan—I do not want to bring in the names of others.

Mr. Stockton repeated the question.

Mr. Harlan—Well. I will make inquiry of the Chairman whether it is necessary that I shall answer that question.

The committee room was cleared, and after a conference of dileen minutes among the mesohers the doors were reopened, and Mr. Morrill, the Chairman, announced that the committee was of the oblinon that any question asked as to the distribution of the money received was pertinent. The question was then asked :—

WHAT WAS THE NAME OF THE FRIEND?

A. Carlton.

Q. Do I understand that you handed him the check?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What was done with the money afterward? A. It was under my control, but I am not distinct whether Mr. Carlton handed the money to me or a friend.

Q. Do you recollect in what shape the money was? A. It was in currency.

Q. You have no recollection as to what Mr. Carlton did with it? A. It was used to defray the expenses of the election in lown; I have no doubt it was applied as funds are usually applied in such cases.

Q. Towards your election as Senator? A. Well, yes; towards the election—Wilmess did not remember Carlton's first name; I have no doubt it was applied as funds are usually applied in such cases.

Q. Towards your election as Senator? A. Well, yes; towards the election—Wilmess did not remember Carlton's first name; I have no doubt it was applied as funds are name; I have no doubt it was beyond the second first name; I have no doubt it was beyond the second first name; I have no doubt it was beyond the second first name; I have no doubt it was beyond the second first name; I have no doubt it was be placed to have york, where he could be found now.

Q. Did you receive any other runds from any agents, employe or officer of any railroad company; A. Not that I know of. Witness then explained that he was in New York, where he received the check from Durant, and asked Carlton where the bank was; he asked me if thad any

in New York, or there here or in New York, to whom that \$5,000 was distributed.

Mr. Harlan—Well, I leave it to the Chairman if I am to answer that Chairman notified Mr. Harlan that he must an-

Q. Who did Noble get it from ? A. I don't remember whether it was from me or some one else.

In answer to questions of Mr. Scott the witness testified that the money was used in paying the expenses of friends in the Senatorial election; so far as it depended on witness it was so used.

Q. by Mr. Stevenson—Did you, after May 1, 1865, to January 1, 1866, receive any other money from any president, vice president, agent or employe of any of the three roads known as the Pacific roads? A. Not that I am aware of, so far as I can now remember.

Mr. Stevenson said he had some other questions to ask Mr. Harlan, but would postpone them until he (Mr. Harlan) should make the examination as to the date of the checks.

checks.

Mr. Wright—Some portion of the money was used to defray expenses already incurred in the election; did not think much of it went into the hands of the Chairman of the State Executive Committee; at any rate, a large portion did not.

At four o'clock the committee adjourned until ten o'clock to-morrow.

THE CENTRAL PACIFIC C. M.

C. P. Huntington, the Vice President, count of the Condition of the Road, and How the Contract and Finance

WASHINGTON, Feb. 14, 1873. Mr. C. P. Huntington, Vice President of the Central Pacific Railroad Company, was examined be-fore the Wilson Crédit Mobilier Committee this road. He detailed the financial embarrassments under which the company labored in building the

mider which the company labored in building the road.

The first contracts, embracing perhaps seventy-four or seventy-five miles of the road, were let to eight or ten different parties; L. D. Smith had one contract to build five miles of the road; witness said Charles Crocker & Co. had a contract, but did not remember for how many miles nor the sum of money paid them; the Contract and Finance Company was organized in 1867; witness thought to procure labor at reasonable prices and inke contracts for constructing the road; the was one of the incorporators and believed

**THE CAPITAL STOCK WAS FIVE MILLION DOLLARS; was Financial and Business Manager of the Central Pacific Railroad in the East at the organization of the road; was five Capital to the company; witness got the impression that the Contract and Finance Company was to receive in payment for building 620 miles of road a part in the stock of the contract and Finance Company was to receive in payment for building 620 miles of road a part in the stock of conditions of the contract and payment of the road and a part in bonds; the company had already they (the large amount of from for the road and a part in the stock of the contract and Finance Company they (the large amount of from for the road and the contract and Finance Company had not the covernment and first mortgage bonds; witness' impression was that the Contract and Finance Company pany received the covernment and first mortgage bonds; witness' impression was that the Contract and Finance Company made nothing on this contract but a certain amount of stock, and the stock was not then worth more than ten per cent as collateral; witness proceived the covernment and first mortgage bonds; witness' but could not-say how much; at present holds, perhaps, a million dollars' worth of stock in the road, then of the road of the contract and some stock, also a tew land grants, but could not-say how much; at present holds, perhaps, a million dollars' w

delts of the company.

By Mr. Shellabarger—Suppose the government should require the payment of the whole of the semi-annual interest on the government subsidy except what you pay in the way of transpertation, would you be able punctually to meet the interest? A. I have no doubt that the Central Facilite Railroad Company can meet all its legal obligations.

Q. Could you sidy and also on the bonds as they fail down at the company could.

The witness, in further examination, said the gross earnings of the road were \$12,800,000, and that the running expenses were a little over 10rty per cent; no dividends had been paid to the stockholders.

By Mr. Hoar—List in of your belief the persons who have been prominent in the management of the road, including yourself, have received considerable values, either in money, bonds or stocks, as profits on contracts made for its construction? A. I think

If I have received any at all it is as a stockholder and in connection with the Contract and Finance Company.

Q. Are not your profits more than a million of dollars?

A. Not actually, but I think the nominal or face value of the stock of the Central Pacific Railroad I received would be equal to that sum.

Q. Is it not your belief that your firm received in the shape of bonds considerable profits on your shares? A. My impression is we have received some value in bonds.

Q. Is it not wore belief? A. I think the vy likely.

Q. Is it not over five houndred thousand dollars? A. Not five hundred thousand dollars.

Witness, having been interrogated as to the business of Mr. Franchot at Washington, said it was to bring the at-

Winess, having been interrogated as to the business of mr. Franchot at Washington, said it was to bring the attention of members of Congress to the views of the company on the pending questions.

Q. is Mr. Franchot known as concerned in what is known as the lobby? A. Not at all; Mr. Franchot is the agent of the Central Facine Bailroad; he is above repreach; I have known him too many years.

In answer to a question by Mr. Hoar witness said he was here in 1-64; he recollected meeting Joseph B. Stewart as a man of considerable influence.

Witness having been reminded that Stewart testified that he received money from witness, the latter said if Stewart had so testified it was true, he gave Stewart \$2,000 to be used in a proper way to explain the affairs of the company; witness had never given money or anything of value, or paid directly or divertly to any member of Congress for the sake of interesting him in any matter concerning the Central Facile Railroad; he had no knowledge of money having been paid by others for such purposes, nor did the vemove the received money of the fact of Set for the benefit of the Pacific Railroad; he had no knowledge of money having been paid by others for such purposes, nor did he vemove the securities of the fact of Set for the benefit of the Pacific Railroad.

A long examination followed as to the stock and bonds, interest, &c., of the road.

Mr. Sheliabarger asked what was the aggregate amount of profits divided among the members of the construction company for that company?

The witness replied that he did not know, nor were any of the gentlemen who could answer the question now in his part of the country; the books too were in California; nothing was done that was not proper to be done; the road was built at less expense than any other road proportionately as to the length and under like circumstances; the company have done everything they agreed to do for the government, which had been better served than the company.

The committee adjourned till to-morrow morning.

MUSICAL AND THEATRICAL NOTES.

The fourth Philarmonic concert takes place this evening at the Academy of Music.

Madame Nilsson-Rouzeaud will positively appear in this city in Italian opera next season, beginning

A proof of the great popularity of Mr. G. L. Fox is seen in the faces of many little children while contemplating the remarkable face of "Humpty

so great that the orchestra has been put out of sight, and chairs are placed in the fiddlers' places to accommodate the audience.

A new play, entitled "Without a Heart," by Mrs. Sheridan Shook, is soon to be produced at the Union Square Theatre, with Miss Agnes Ethel in the leading part. It is spoken of by those who have seen it as a strong play. Miss Ethel concludes her Boston engagement this evening and appears in Brooklyn next week.

The Mills matince at Steinway Hall this after-

noon promises to be a very brilliant affair. Mr. Mills will play Liszt's "Midsummer Night's Dream" and an arrangement of his own from Schumann and Chopin, with a transcription of the "Blue Danube Valse," which he never before performed in public. The soloists include many well-known names, and the programme is not too classical for the popular

Miss Bickford, who, we are told, "came here a stranger and did not at first understand how to untie and unravel the red tape which certain incompe tents have, by virtue of custom, tied about the efforts of strange artists for a hearing," is soon to appear in this city in a play specially written for her. We are further assured that she is "a comedienne of true talent, who has conquered a conti nent in a professional way, and is pleasant and handsome and quite magnetic enough to carry any audience with her." We sincerely hope she may succeed in spite of the overpraise and false ideas of "red tape" which her injudicious friends are putting into the newspapers.

TAKEN ON CHANCE,

George L. Ganty was arrested by Detective George Eider, on Thursday, on suspicion of being concerned in a robbery of some extent that took place one day during the week. Ganty was previously taken by the same officer on Tuesday last on a Fourth avenue car, where the officer supposed he had intended to operate. When they got to Union had intended to operate. When they got to Union square, on the way to Central Office, Ganty twisted himself out of the officer's hands and escaped. Detective Eider met him in the street on Thursday and again arrested him. He was about taking the prisoner to Court yesterday morning when Detective Heidelberg stopped him, saying, "Wast, I want that man," The prisoner was sent back to the cells, as he is supposed to be connected with a robbery of \$5,000, done by what is known as "Red Tim's gang," Captain Irving sent out officers yesterday to nunt up evidence against Ganty, and he will be arraigned at the Tombs Police Court before Judge Hogan to-day.

POMEROY'S NEMESIS.

York's First Favor from the Christian Kansas Senator.

THE ALICE CATON SCANDAL

The Curious Use York Made of Some Affidavits.

A NIGHT IN BALTIMORE.

Where is the Young Man Who Slept with Senator Pemeroy?

The Danger of Appointing a Young Lady to a Treasury Clerkship-The Way York Convinced the Senator-"Knowledge is Power" Enough to Move a Land Office.

TOPEKA, Feb. 9, 1873. The great Pomeroy-York political exposure and sensation has served fully to develop, as I set forth in my last letter, the curious scandal which pertains in a certain manner to Senator Pomeroy's social reputation, and which has now for the first time, though a matter of some little notoriety for several years past, been placed on record in an official manner. It may be as well for the people to know that the composition of the Legislative Investigating Committee is by no means of a partisan character-i. e., so far as partisanship ordinarily exists. In this Legislature of 133 members there are just 132 republicans of the radical stripe and one liberal republican. He, solitary and independent, constitutes the purely political minority, and you may estimate his delightful position when I say that, in answer to my question whether there were any democrats in either House, I was answered by a member :-

"Yes; one-at least he is a liberal, and that's just

the same thing." In the aspect of partisanship the two Houses, prior to York's exposure of "the old man," were simply Pomeroy and anti-Pomeroy, with the chances largely in favor of Pomeroy for the Senatorship. His

TWELVE YEARS OF OFFICIAL LIFE

had to a certain extent strengthened him, so that he was a dictator, in a fashion, of the affairs of the State, and though he had unquestionably become unpopular as a rule among the people there was not wanting a large element among the politicians who clung tenaciously to his skirts with the same spirit of obsequiousness and self-interest that a political "king-pin" always commands. The Committee of Investigation, then, is divided in its views only on this question of personality, and a majority, probably, were Pomeroy men, though just at present it is a little difficult to pick out any Pomeroy men, except those who were so zealous and unfortunate as to have been blatant of their preferences just before the election of Ingalis, Of course they have got to face it, and as they comprise most of the able men in the Legislature they make out to hold their positions with some dig nity and considerable skill. I have said this much order to forestall a very likely misapprehension in the public mind regarding either the propriety or necessity of bringthe Caton-Pomeroy affair up in this present inquiry. It would, viewed by the people at a distance, present a spectacle somewhat re-sembling that of a stable full of jackasses kicking the dead lion, but no such ungrateful conduct is being indulged in. York told such a straight cirtopic that probably the only man who would contradict it is Pomeroy himself-and then people would laugh at him. But there were, of course, Pomeroy men on the committee, and they made up their minds that even if

were humbled his victorious enemy should at least make no elluring reputation for himself out of

"The existence of the Caton scandal is well the facts of that scandal for purposes of blackmail." And so, while Pomeroy's political reputation was blasted by an insidious enemy his social reputation is being tickled up by his friends acting in the role of avengers. There are several lawyers on the committee-indeed York nimself is a lawyer, as well as a lawmaker and exsoldier-and they apparently understand the legal maxim, "When you have got no detence attack the other side." And that is just how the committee came to take up the Caton affair yesterday and pursue it up to nine o'clock last night, at which time it was understood they had got all they expected to get out of York and would need him no more on the witness stand at least. When the committee had assembled the Chairman, Senator Guerin, read the following despatch, which he was authorized to telegraph to Washington:—

Toryar, Kansas Feb 8, 1873.

Hon. S. C. Ponkhoy:—

TOPKKA, Kansas, Feb. 8, 1873.

I am instructed to notify you that the joint committee appointed to investigate charges of bribery and corruption against you are now in session. Your presence by the committee is respectfully requested. If you are not able to attend, any verified statement by you of the matter of the York exposure will be duly considered by the committee. Very respectfully. Very respectfully, W. E. GUERIN, Chairman of Committee.

committee. Very respectfully.

W. E. GUERIN, chairman of Committee.

The direct examination of York was then resumed by Mr. Hutchings:—
Q. I understand you to say that you requested Page to ascertain if it would be agreeable to Pomeroy to see you in company with a friend. Had you then formed the plan to expose Pomeroy by the means afterward resorted to? A. I had not.
Q. Had you at the time you requested Page to do this had any interview with Pomeroy except the one in the hall and the time you went with Glimore after coming to Topeka? A. Not that I can now remember.
Q. When you went with Glimore did he ask you to go? A. It was in this way—Glimore did not know as I would be willing to see Pomeroy, and I told him I would not hesitate to go with him to see Pomeroy, as I was anxious to help Glimore if possible.

Of It you had not at the time you requested

Pomeroy, as I was anxious to help Gilmore if possible.

Q. If you had not, at the time you requested Page to arrange this interview, formed this plan to expose Pomeroy, why did you seek such an interview? A. I did not seek the interview; after being solicited several times by Page to see Pomeroy, I did request Page to ascertain if Pomeroy desired, or would see me in the presence of a friend; but the request was not in the way of asking an interview, but as to Pomeroy's willingness to have me take a friend with me.

Q. Had you, at that time, any reason to believe that Pomeroy was using money to influence members of the Legislature to vote for him? A. I had not.

that Pomercy was using money to influence members of the Legislature to vote for him? A. I had not.

Q. When did you first form the acquaintance of Simpson and Johnson? A. At the time of that interview.

Q. Was there any understanding between Simpson, Johnson and yourself that you were to obtain evidence from Pomercy to use against him in the cancus? A. There was not.

Q. Have you stated in your previous testimony the substance of all the matters discussed and talked of between yourself and Pomercy at the last interview with him on the night of January 27, 1873? A. I don't think of anything I omitted that I deemed of any importance; I intended to state the substance of that interview.

Q. Did you not visit Washington before the Senatorial election as the agent of your city to procure the removal of the United States Land Office from Needesha to Independence? A. I did.

Q. When and with whom did you go to Washington? A. I left Independence the ember 26, 1871, for Washington; Judge De Long, now Mayor of Independence, had preceded me a few days.

Q. Did you take a letter from Wilson, then Mayor of Independence, to General McEwen. A. I did.

Q. When you arrived in Washington did you see and solvit the assistance and influence of Fomercy to further the object of your visit? A. I did.

Q. Did you also see and solvict the influence and assistance of Senator Caldwell and Representative Lowe? A. I did; I met those three gentlemen at the residence of Senator Caldwell on the evening of January 15, 1872, Judge Delahay also being present; the decision of the delegation at that time was unanimous in favor of taking no action for the time being to effect the removal of the United States Land Office to Independence.

Q. Did you limmediately or soon after the interview with these three gentlemen visit General McEwen, and present your letter from Mayor Wilson? A. I did; I think the day following.

Q. In your interview with General McEwen did you receive from him any pasers bearing upon the character of Pomercy? A. I received pap

ing of that day at the Metropoli tan Hotel—I think that was the name of the hotel.

Q. Have you a copy of those papers? A. I have.
Q. Will you produce the copy? (Witness here produced the copy, marked exhibit "A." and filed.)

THE APPIDAVIT OF MISS CATON.

BALTIMORE, Md., July 6, 1808.

I. Alice Catom, solemnly swear and aftirm that Hon. S.
C. Pomeroy, after having procured me employment in the United States Treasury, did approach me with dishonorable offers, and for fear I might lose my place, I did so with Hon. S. C. Pomeroy to Baltimore, Md., and slept during and night of 28th of February, 1863, at said during said night of 29th of February, 1863, at said hotel in Bullimore, Md. In testimony whereof of the foregoing and within I hereby sign my name this day and year above written. Witness, I. A. Louisi.

noted in Bailtimore Md.

In testimony whereof of the foregoing and within I hereby sign my name this day and year above written.

Witness, I. A. Louiri.

Sworn to and acknowledged before me this 6th day of July, 1888.

George R. Hylash, Notary Public.

The ailidayit of W. C. Carman accompanying the above document corroborates Miss Caton's statement, the affidayit testifying to ocular knowledge of the commission of the offence.

Q. After receiving these papers from General McEwen did you go to Pomeroy's house? A. I did, that same evening.

Q. Did you see Fomeroy that evening, and, if so, under what circumstances? A. I did; he received me in what I would designate as his middle parior; the second room from the entrance; I remember others being present, and while I was there Senator Caldwell came in.

Q. What, if anything, did you do and say to Senator Pomeroy on that evening, and what did he do or say, if anything? A. After a few moments' general conversation, I remember his asking me when I was going home; I expressed the wisn to have an interview with him at his earliest convenience, and asked him if I could not see him at his committee room next morning; Pomeroy excused himself to his guests and invited me into the next room, farther from the street, and indicated his willingness to hear what I had to offer then; he sat down upon a sofa or longe, I think, and I took a chair in front of him; I showed him the papers I had received from General McEwen and asked him to read them; he said fir reply to interrogations by me that he did write a letter recommending the appointment to a position in the United States Treasury Department of the woman therein referred to; that he was at Barnum's Hotel in Batimore, Md., at the time stated in said papers; that

The woman restated in said papers; that the same time said he did not remember the number of the room he occupied that night and that occupied by

THE SAME MEN WITH THE SAME WOMAN

senators Morton and Chandler; I understood him to mean that

THE SAME MEN WITH THE SAME WOMAN had made the similar charges against Morton and Chandler; said he hated to have such things brought out against him, even if they were false, and did not want to take the time and trouble to disprove them; and that he would very much regret having such things said of him by persons of character and standing, but did not care what the democratic papers might say, as it would be regarded as a political lie.

Q. Did you not at the time you handed these papers to Senator Pomeroy speak about the Land Office and say in substance that you wanted to show him that you were in earnest, or that you had never been able to make him understand the importance of the removal of the Land Office to Independence, to him personally?

A. I did, and explained to him in what manner; that he had bitter enemies in Independence, and that this matter of the papers referred to was known to several there; that the Democrat had already published something about it, but that the better part of the community had never given credit to their trantfulness; but if we failed to get the Land Office after what he had promised to the people while there, and to Colonel Grass and Mayor Wilson since, that it was not improbable that, in their disappointment in not getting the office and

THER INDIGNATION TOWARDS MM.

They might use these statements against him; that Mayor Wilson was cognizant of the allegations and charges contained therein and was personally acquainted with W. C. Carman; that the removal of the Land Office would tend to make him friends and disarm any attempt to slander him or injure his character in connection with these charges; that was, just as near as I can remember, my statement to him.

Q. What else, if anything, did Pomeroy say? A. In addition to what I have already given, he said in substance that he particularly desired me to stand by him in this matter, and pledged himself on the honor of a man that the Land Office should go to Indep

substance that

IIE COULD HAVE WHATEVER HE ASKED
of the Interior Department; that he was in earnest
now about this matter, and would meet me at the
commissioner's office the next morning at eight
o'clock and arrange the matter definitely.

The committee here took a recess. Upon resuming the atternoon session, ou motion of Mr. Scoffeld,
the resolution adopted at the organization of the
committee, restraining the press from publishing
the testimony until permission to that effect was the testimony until permission given, was rescinded, and the CROSS-EXAMINATION OF SENATOR YORK

was resumed by Mr. Hutchings.
Q. Did you know that McEwen had these affidavits before you went to Washington? A. I think about the matter; I cannot state whether I asked McEwen for them or he first offered them to me; I

davits; I went to McEwen to learn what he knew about the matter; I cannot state whether I asked McEwen for them or he first offered them to me; I cannot remember whether Wishon's letter introducing me to McEwen mentioned the affidavits or not, but think it did, as Wilson had been in Washington just previously and told me he had spoken on the subject to McEwen.

Q. Was not the purport of that letter that McEwen was to furnish those affidavits to you if necessary, to influence Pomeroy to assist in the removal of the Land Office? A. I cannot state as to that, but I understood the object of it to be to enable me to obtain the information from General McEwen to use as I might require in securing the removal; the affidavits I got from McEwen were copies of the originals, or knew where they were.

Q. When you went to Pomeroy's house that night did you not intend to use those affidavits to influence Pomeroy to assist in removing the Land Office?

A. I did, by showing to him the situation of affairs as I have already stated; the city of Independence paid expenses of four delegates to Washington, including myself, and furnished office refor one year, paid expenses of removal of the office from Neodesha to Independence and assumed payment of clerk hire in the Register's and Receiver's office for one year, amounting to \$3,400, for which they issued scrip.

THE OFFICE LIFED.

Q. After this interview with Pomeroy, when you showed him the affidavits, did you see him again before you left Washington? A. Yes; I saw him next day at Commissioner Drammond's room, in the Interior Department, and went with Mr. Pomeroy to Secretary Delano's office, and from there to the Capitol with him, and afterwards saw him again in the waiting room of the Senate chamber; I think while we were in Mr. Drummond's room he took me into a smaller room and gave me a letter purporting to be from W. C. Carnan to him about the charges made in the affidavits, with the request that I would copy the same, return to him the original, and asking me to retain th

Witness was here requested to produce the copy of the letter, which he did, and the letter was put in evidence.

Q. The amidavits which you got of McEwen were published a few days before the Senatorial election last month, were they not, and distributed in circular form about Topeka? A. They were; but I desire to say it was done without my having anything to do with it, and that such publication was not made from the copies in my possession; he mentioned them to me at the interview I had with him here, in the presence of Major Eldridge, Captain Peck and Mr. Page; he said something about a Mr. Starr having

TRIED TO BLACKMAIL HIM
or sell him the affidavits, and that it understood they were to be published, and that it would elect him, if it were done, on the first vote; I answered him at that time that I had nothing to do with the affidavits being published, and that I never knew that Starr knew anything about them until I reached Lawrence, on my way to Topeka; Mr. Pomeroy spoke of having received a letter from Mr. Wilson, of Independence, soon after his (Pomeroy's) arrival here, informing him that Starr was going to Topeka with those alifidavits.

Q. Did you have any conversation about the affidavits when you got the \$2,000? A. I think not, Q. At the time you were in Washington were you not the editor of a mewspaper? A. I was not; I had a financial interest in the South Kansas Tribune, but no part in its finangement; I wrote to and received letters from Pomeroy in reference to the removal of the Land Office; I received four and wrote two.

Witness produced a letter dated January 17, 1872, from Mr. Pomeroy, saving, "I received this from the hands of Mr. Pomeroy before I left Washington," and a letter dated January 28, 1872, saying, "I received this letter atter I got home and answered it."

Witness also produced the reply referred to, dated February 6, 1872; also a letter from Pomeroy,

Witness also produced the reply referred to, dated February 6, 1872; also a letter from Pomeroy, dated February 3, 1872, and a letter from Pomeroy, dated February 3, 1872, and a letter in reply thereto, dated February 8, 1872; also letter from Pomeroy, dated February 12, 1872, which witness said he did not remember having replied to.

Q. (By Senator Guerin)—Did you or did you not, while in Washington, at any interview with Mr. Pomeroy, threaten to use the amdavits you had against him if he did not use his influence to secure the removal of the Land Office? A. I did not.

Q. (By Mr. Scofield)—Then what was your object

in showing these affidavits to Mr. Pomero' at his house in Washington? A. It was with a view of inducing him to aid in getting the Land Office to Independence.

Q. (By Mr. McDermott) —What words did you use in addressing Mr. Pomeroy just previous to showing the affidavits of Alice Caton and W. C. Carman at Washington city? A. As near as I can give the words, I suid, before

HANDING HIM THE APPIDAVITS,

"Senator Pomeroy, I have never been able to show you how greatly in earnest our people are about getting the Land Office removed and the importance of their success to yourself," or "to you personally."

about getting the Land Office removed and the importance of their success to yourself," or "to you personally."

Q. Did you, after saying this, hand him the affidavits without further remarks on your part? A. It is my impression that I did. I have been trying the refresh my memory as to whether I did make any explanation of my meaning to him before he read the affidavits or not, and my conclusion is that I did not until atterwards.

Q. Were you at any time a personal political friend of Seuator Pomeroy, and, if so, when did that friendship terminate, and what caused its termination? A. I was at one time a personal political friend of Mr. Pomeroy, and never had cause to think him unworthy until I had been to Washington; I did not then deem the information I had received against him sufficient to justify me in taking a public stand against him, and it was not until I had become a candidate for the position I now hold that I regarded it as my duty to declare against his re-election, and I did so before I received my nomination for the same position.

Q. Did you, in conversation with P. B. Maxon, at any time previous to the late Senatorial election, state that the means resorted to to defeat Mr. Pomeroy were more degrading than any means that Mr. Pomeroy could use to secure his re-election, or any words to that effect? A. I do not think I did, but I remember speaking to Mr. Maxon in regard to the publication of those affidavits as out of place and to be deprecated, and that it tended to disgust a good many—or words to that effect.

At the eventual the secure we have the secure of the content.

tended fo disgust a good many—or words to that effect.

YORK'S DISCLAIMER.

At the evening session Mr. York said, in reply to permission to make any jurther statement he desired:—"Until after the late Senatorial election I have never spoken of my interview with Mr. Pomeroy at Washington. I never showed the papers received from General McEwen except to a few confidential friends. During the late contest I have never sought to use this matter against him, and knew nothing about the design of Mr. Starr until the time stated. I had nothing, directly or indirectly, to do with the publication of those afficients, and the knewledge I gained from Mr. Pomeroy and his being at Baltimore, and so forth, I have kept sacred with me, so far as giving it to the public. Until I became a candidate for my present position I never said or did anything to injure Mr. Pomeroy in public esteem, and in that matter of the affidavits I have kept faith with him honestly. I have never applied to him for any public position or any personal favors of any kind whatever, and I have never been injured personally in any way by him, and in no sense have I been actuated in my late conduct by personal uniriendliness to him."

Q. (Ry Mr. Hutchings)—Did you not, in this

been actuated in my late conduct by personal uniriendliness to him."

Q. (Ry Mr. Hutchings)—Did you not, in this
committee room, after rehearsing the circumstances of your interview with Mr. Pomeroy at
his house in Washington, when you showed him
the affidavits, use the following language:—"I
confess that the means employed by me to secure
Mr. Pomeroy's induence were questionable, but I
went to get the Land office, and I got it?" A. E
think that is what I said, unless the word "perhaps" was in there; I think I said "perhaps questionable."

Q. Did you then intend

naps" was in there; I think I said. "pernaps questionable."

Q. Did you then intend to mean that the showing of the affidavits to Pomeroy to secure his induence was "pernaps questionable." A. Yes.

To Mr. Guerin—I went to Washington as the agent of the city of Independence, and was furnished with a letter from the Mayor to General McEwen, with an intimation that he (McEwen) might help me.

This closed the day's testimony, and the committee adjourned until Monday morning, when Ben Simpson, J. C. Horton and Governor Osborn, t is said, will be called to the witness stand.

THE POMEROY INVESTIGATION. Remarkable Statement Before the Con mittee by a Remarkable Individual. St. Louis, Feb. 14, 1873.

the Pomeroy Investigating Committee at Topeka Kan., to the effect that Pomeroy authorized him to use money to influence the votes of Represent atives Davis and Cummings, but that he (Pomeroy) furnished him with no money to pay them. He also swore he was authorized by Judge Horten to offer Representative Bacon \$2,000 to vote for Pomeroy, and that he made the offer and Mr. Bacom reinsed it. He testified further that he was the guest of Mr. Pomeroy at the hotel during the canvass, and, in answer to a question, said he used to live at Waterloo, lowa, where he was once convicted of burgiary and served two years and a half in the Penitentiary, but was afterwards pardoned by the Governor, it being discovered that he was innocent of the crime; and further, that he told Judge Horton and Colonel Ennis a few days since if they would loan him \$60 he would leave the city and not appear before the committee. atives Davis and Cummings, but that he (Pomeroy)

BOGY'S ELECTION.

Loud Calls to Have the Senatorial Investigation Reopened.

St. Louis, Feb. 14, 1873. inority report on the subject of the Senatorial bribery case, submitted to the House yesterday, says that it seems from the report that very important statements before the co tee have been concealed from the lie, and adds that the report will than ever convince the people of Missour-than ever convince the people of Missour-that this investigation has been an exceedingly superficial, and, in vindication of Colonel Bogy, a worse than worthless one. We once more demand, in behalf of Colonel Bogy's reputation and in behal of the democracy of this State, that the case by taken up again and dealt with in a manner becom-ing grown up men.

NEW PHASE OF THE LOUISIANA HUBBUR.

NEW ORLEANS, La., Feb. 14, 1873. At a meeting of both Legislatures yesterday, the republicans agreed to accept the proposition of the fusionists to organize a General Assembly, composed of members returned by both Boards, pro-viced such course is acceptable to the national administration. A committee was appointed to telegraph the Washington authorities for infor-mation.

THE CERMAN LIBERALS. .

Further Reorganization-Sympathizing with Havemeyer and Spain.

The German Liberal Democratic Central Com mittee, recently organized from the ranks of the late German liberal republican organizaeffected a fusion during the late Presidential campaign, held a meeting at the Teutonic Assembly Rooms last night. Judge Michael C. Gross o Rooms last night. Judge Michael C. Gross occupied the chair, and Mr. Anthony Erokhoff, on behalf of the Executive Committee, submittee a report, stating that the committee had been organized by the election of himself as chairman and by the formation of the following committees:—Finance Committee, Henry Woltmann, Dr. William Schirmer, Edward Bucks, Claus Puckhofer, Edward Schilsting, Adam Stock and John Honig; Committee of Organization; Coroner Herrman, Henry Shields and others. Committee of Naturalization, Andrew Schmidt, G. Fuessel and others; Publication Committee, Dr. Teodor Micrson, Peter Bauer and others; Committee on Resolutions and Correspondence, Dr. Hartwig Gerke, Charles Wendt and others.

and others; Committee on Resolutions and Correspondence, Dr. Hartwig Gerke, Charles Wendt and others.

Resolutions were passed declaring that the attempt of the dominiant party to change the present administration of affairs in our city is sufficient evidence of the folly of the democrats and other friends of municipal reform to make combinations and bargains before the election with a party whose leaders do not hesitate to repusiate all promises after the same; and that they sympathize with the friends of reform and of a responsible city administration in rallying areum Mayor Havemeyer.

Resolutions were also passed calling upon the Commissioners for the revision of the constitution to introduce an amendment to the constitution making common school education obligatory as a means to root out the increasing corruption and crime in this country, especially in the large cities.

On motion of Dr. Gerke a resolution was passed congratulating the people of Spain on the establishment of the Republic in Spain, and a long discussion ensued regarding the means of communicating this action to the Spanish government, without arriving at a definite decision.

REAL ESTATE MATTERS.

One Sale on 'Change Only-Several Good legal sale was held yesterday on the

Exchange, of No. 66 Front street, four story brick. store, 20.8x85.6 on one side and 85.11 feet on the store, 20.8x85.0 on one side and 85.11 feet on the other, made by E. H. Ludlow & Co. to W. W. Thompson, for \$17.700. This property had been sold about one month ago, but the purchaser finding the lot several inches shorter than the specification sued to recover his advance payment, and won the stat; hence the reselling of the property.

At private sale we have the following transactions to report:

By L. Friedman and G. Lespinasse, one plot of ground on the south side of 57th street, 75 feet east of 5th av., 67 feet front, 70 feet on rear and 100 feet deep, for \$75,000.

By John NicClave, four story house and lot on the south side of 114th st., 100 feet east of 2d av., 102 2000 feet brown stone house 175 East 73d st., 2x45xhair the block, for \$5,500.

By M. M. J. Weed Bell the events of the south state of the south.

brown stone house 175 East 73d st., 2x45xhalf the block, for \$5,500.

By Mr. J. Weed Bell, the owner, one lot on the southwest corner of 7th ay, and 145th st., 24.11x100 feet, for \$5,000.